DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 157 UD 024 358

TITLE Mentor 1983-84. Evaluation Section Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; *Career Exploration; *Cooperative Programs; Curriculum Development; Educational Cooperation; Lawyers; *Legal Education; Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York); Project Mentor NY

ABSTRACT

Mentor, a law-related program sponsored by the Federal Bar Council, New York Alliance for the Public Schools and the New York City Public Schools, completed its second year of operation in 1983-84. This evaluation report focuses on the 1983-84 program expansion implemented in spring 1983. Mentor consists of a series of one-day activity sessions and includes visits to state and federal courts and several supplementary activities such as mock-trial competitions. Each of the 22 junior and senior high schools participating in the program was paired with a New York City general practice law firm or a legal department. Evaluation findings indicate that participating students' knowledge of and attitude towards the law improved during the course of the program. Teachers found the newly developed Mentor manual helpful and the training sessions worthwhile. Attorneys applauded the school system's effort to provide students with a realistic view of the legal profession. For the future it is recommended that (1) schools and law firms be paired early enough to allow for more program preparation, (2) a greater number of less academically prepared students be included, and (3) the feasibility of extending the program to a full year be explored. (RDN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED260157

Evaluation Section Report
Robert Tobias, Administrator
John E. Schoener, Senior Manager

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.K. Minter
NYC Bd. of Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MENTOR

1983-84

Prepared by the
High School Evaluation Unit:

Dolores M. Mei
Evaluation Manager

Frank Guerrero
Evaluation Specialist

Sally Renfro
Evaluation Consultant

UD024358

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this report is the result of a collaborative effort of full-time staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the cover, Elly Bulkin, Warren Cohen, Kimberly Kinsler, and Thomas Palmaccio spent many hours interviewing program administrators, coding their responses and analyzing the data upon which this report is based. Frances Durney has typed, corrected, and duplicated this report. The Unit could not have produced this report without their able participation.

SUMMARY

Mentor, a law-related program sponsored by the Federal Bar Council, New York Alliance for the Public Schools and the New York City Public Schools, completed its second year of operation in 1983-84. Twenty-two public junior and senior high schools, 22 prominent New York City law firms, and nearly 600 students participated in Mentor 1983-84. These figures represent an expansion of the pilot program which included 200 students, five high schools, and five law firms. This evaluation report focuses on the 1983-84 program expansion implemented in spring, 1983.

Mentor consists of a series of one-day activity sessions and includes visits to state and federal court and several supplementary activities such as mock-trial competitions. Each junior and senior high school participating in the program was paired with a New York City general-practice law firm or a legal department representing local government law, public interest and civil rights law, labor law, or corporate law. The typical Mentor student was 16 years old, held a B grade point average, and was planning to attend a four-year college.

Mentor was successful. Evaluation findings indicate that participating students' knowledge of and attitude towards the law improved during the course of the program. Teachers found the newly-developed Mentor manual helpful and the training sessions worthwhile. Attorneys applauded the school system's effort to provide students with a realistic view of the legal profession.

Among the recommendations included in this report are the following:

- Schools and law firms should be paired early enough to allow for more program preparation.
- A greater number of less academically prepared students should be included in Mentor since this type of student showed the greatest positive change in attitudes toward the legal system.
- The feasibility of extending the program to a full year should be explored, possibly by having a few law firm school pairs pilot such a program format.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Summary	ii
List of Tables	iv
I. Introduction	1
Program Background	1
Method and Scope of the Evaluation	2
II. Implementation Findings	4
Curriculum Development and Teacher Training	4
Selection of Mentor Participants	5
Project Orientation	7
Project Components	7
Curriculum Guides	12
III. Attitudinal Findings	15
Program Goals	15
Attitudinal Change	16
Participant Suggestions	16
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations	18
Appendix: Participating Schools in the 1983-84 MENTOR Program	19

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Students' Educational Plans by School in Percentages	8
2	Teachers' Mean Ratings of Manual Topics	13

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

In the spring of 1983, the New York City Public Schools, in concert with the Federal Bar Council and the New York City Alliance for the Public Schools, began what was to become the nation's largest law-related education program: Mentor. The basic premise of Mentor is simple: law influences every aspect of our daily lives; therefore, an awareness of the law and its role in our society is necessary if students are to become active participants in our democratic republic. Mentor was designed to give students a first-hand look at how the judicial and legislative branches of government function by allowing them to accompany attorneys to federal and state courts and to the New York City Board of Estimate of the City Council. The goals of the program are:

- to assist students in recognizing the impact of the law on their daily lives;
- to make students more aware of their rights and responsibilities as citizens;
- to increase students' knowledge and appreciation of the legal system of the United States; and
- to provide information on possible careers in the legal profession.

In the 1982-83 pilot Mentor program, five of New York City's most prominent law firms were paired with five of tne city's public high schools. Two hundred students participated in Mentor that first year. They toured law firms, visited federal and state courts, spoke with judges in chambers, and sat in on both criminal and civil cases in progress. The Reagan Administration acknowledged the pilot Mentor program as one of the country's outstanding "Partnerships in Education" programs.

Mentor recently completed its second year of operation. The 1983-84 program was expanded to include junior, as well as senior, high schools. Twenty-two schools were paired with 18 law firms, as well as with the lawyers of the New York Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union; the New York City Corporation Counsel; the general counsel's office of District Local 37; and the Legal Department of J.C. Penney Company. The total number of one-day activity sessions was reduced from five days to three days and included visits to federal and state courts, as well as a visit to a law firm. This change allowed greater flexibility in planning elective activities, such as visits to Family Court, and in supplementary activities, such as mock-trial competitions. This report is an assessment of the Mentor program modifications in 1983-84.*

METHOD AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The 1983-84 Mentor evaluation is based on an analysis of observational data about program components, as well as the results of structured interview and questionnaire responses from a representative sample of participants. Twenty-five students from five of the 22 participating school-firm pairs were interviewed. The sample included: one junior high school law firm pair; three new high school law firm pairs; and one pilot-year high school law firm pair. Two of the sample schools were in Brooklyn, one school was in Queens, one was in the Bronx, and the last was located in Manhattan. Five teachers, one assistant principal, and 13 law firm members were also interviewed. All Mentor teachers were asked to complete a written question-

---

* A comprehensive evaluation of the 1982-83 Mentor program is available from the Office of Educational Assessment, formerly known as the Office of Educational Evaluation.

naire which assessed their background knowledge of the law and their use of the newly-introduced curriculum guides. Finally, questionnaires completed by teachers prior to and after training workshops were also analyzed.

Two major questions were explored in this assessment:

- How were the 1983-84 program modifications implemented?
- Have students' attitudes toward and knowledge of the law and of the legal profession been affected by participation in Mentor?

II. IMPLEMENTATION FINDINGS

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER TRAINING

Mentor teachers interviewed during the 1982-83 program evaluation requested that a teacher's manual be developed to assist them in preparing class lessons related to program activities. In response to this request, the firm of Mudge Rose Guthrie Alexander and Ferdon, in conjunction with the Board of Education's Social Studies Unit of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, prepared a two-volume manual for use in the Mentor program. The first volume covered such topics as "Law as a Profession" and "Justice in the Courts," while the second volume described the workings of the civil and criminal court systems. Both volumes include sample cases, suggested resources, and work sheets. Mentor schools received the manual in February, 1984, prior to the beginning of the spring program.

To supplement the activities outlined in the program manual, teacher-training workshops were held during the 1983-84 program. Although four workshops were envisioned, delays in planning reduced the actual number to two. An analysis of pre-workshop questionnaires, completed by the teachers, suggested that content-specific training sessions would be more helpful than general problem-solving discussions. Thus, Workshop I consisted of a panel-led discussion of the criminal court system, while Workshop II focused on civil litigation procedures in federal and state courts.

Nineteen Mentor teachers attended Workshop I. Panel participants included a criminal court judge, an assistant district attorney, a legal aid attorney, and a court administrator. The discussion centered around criminal court procedures, such as arraignment, defendant's right to counsel and to a speedy trial, and sentencing. The roles of the district attorney and of the

defense attorney were outlined, as were the tactics necessary to the psychology of criminal defense. Alternative forms of sentencing were also noted. Following the panel discussion, there was an open question and answer period.

Fifteen teachers attended Workshop II at which Jacob Fuchsberg, a retired judge of the New York Court of Appeals, gave an overview of the dual system of federal and state courts in the United States. He discussed civil litigation, trial tactics, and the role of the federal courts of appeal in federal civil litigation.

A review of post-workshop questionnaires shows that a majority of teachers found the sessions both helpful and worthwhile. Of those teachers attending Workshop I, 67 percent found it helpful, while 75 percent found Workshop II helpful. The content-specific approach, used in both workshops, was acceptable to 65 percent of the teachers in attendance, but over 70 percent in both groups expressed a need for more classroom-specific training sessions. These teachers want practical guides on how to hold students' interest in the legal profession in a classroom setting.

SELECTION OF MENTOR PARTICIPANTS

Law Firms

Thirteen law firms were added to Mentor in 1983-84. Two of these firms asked to participate, while 11 were invited to join the program. These 13 firms are prominent New York City general-practice law firms involved in all aspects of the legal profession.

Four other legal participants joined Mentor in 1983-84: the Corporation Counsel of the City of New York; the lawyers of the New York Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union; the general counsel's office of

District Local 37; and the legal department of J.C. Penney Company. These participants represent local government law, public interest and civil-rights law, labor law, and corporate law.

Public Schools

Borough High School Superintendents chose the 17 additional public schools added to the Mentor program in 1983-84. There were two criteria for selection: the presence of existing law-related courses within the school, and school administrators' approval of release time for program activities. One exception, however, was made: one law firm predicated its participation on the condition that it be paired with a typical inner-city high school with no ongoing law-related courses. Ths firm was paired with a Manhattan high school with no law-related courses in its curriculum.

Students

Selection criteria for students varied among the five sample schools. One school, for example, chose its top 30 seniors, while two other schools designated an entire pre-law class as participants. The remaining two schools each designated an entire class within a social studies cluster as participants.

Although the actual number of students participating in Mentor varied among the sample schools, in four of the schools, the range was between 20 and 40 students per school. In the fifth school, a junior high school, 90 students were in the program.

While students' ages ranged from 13 to 18, a typical Mentor participant was 16 years old, held a B grade point average, and was planning to attend a

four-year college (See Table 1). The exception to this profile was found in the Manhattan high school with no-law-related program other than Mentor. There a teacher estimated that only 20 to 25 percent of the Mentor students would attend a four-year college. According to teachers, these students' perceptions of their academic abilities were lower than those of typical Mentor participants who saw themselves as above average or the best in the class.

PROJECT ORIENTATION

The Mentor coordinator notified firms and schools of their participation in the program between November, 1983 and January, 1984. As law firms agreed to participate, public schools were selected for possible pairing. This process was time consuming, and as a result, several law firm school pairs were not in place until late January. Thus, preparation time was minimal.

Three administrative meetings were held during Mentor 1983-84. At the first, held in mid-January, schools were paired with law firms. The second, held somewhat later in January, was a lawyers' training workshop run by the New York City Public School's Division of Curriculum and Instruction. At that meeting, attorneys were given an overview of how to work with adolescents. At the third meeting, a general get-together held during the spring semester, the program's progress was discussed.

PROJECT COMPONENTS

Student Activities

The Mentor program included four basic student activities in 1983-84: one orientation seminar and three one-day sessions at various law-related

Table 1

Students' Educational Plans by School in Percentages

How much education do you think you will have?	Schools				
	Queens %	Brooklyn %	Bronx %	Manhattan %	Brooklyn %
Technical School	--	17	--	--	--
Graduate from a two-year college	--	--	--	25	--
Graduate from a four-year college	--	33	60	25	20
Professional or graduate school	100	50	40	--	80
Don't know	--	--	--	50	--
Total	100	100	100	100	100

- Nearly all of the students from four of the five sample schools expected to graduate from college or to attend graduate school.
- One-half of the students from the Manhattan school were unsure of their educational plans.

sites. The orientation seminar, held in the school, was conducted by law-firm representatives. This seminar involved a description of the Mentor program and a general introduction to various aspects of the legal profession.

The first of the three sessions was usually a visit to the sponsoring law firm. There, students were introduced to various attorneys and to support staff such as legal librarians, computer operators, para-legals, and legal secretaries. Students met with a cross-section of the firm's employees, visited individual attorney's offices, observed the in-house print shops, word-processing and computer operations, and visited the law library.

During another session, students accompanied an attorney to a federal courtroom to observe a civil trial. Before the actual courtroom visit, students were briefed as to what issues were involved in the litigation, how the parties obtained federal court jurisdiction, and what elements of the cause of action must be proven in order for the plaintiff to win.

The final session was a visit to a state-court criminal proceeding. Students in the sample schools attended an arraignment. There they observed a crucial step in the procedural due-process rights of the accused. Since procedural due-process constitutes the foundation of the accused person's rights, students were able to observe first-hand one step in the balancing of interests between the state and the individual.

After each of these sessions, students returned with the attorney to the sponsoring law firm for a luncheon at which they discussed the day's observations in the broad context of law and justice in a free society.

Student Participation

Nearly 600 students participated in Mentor during 1983-84. The percentage of students who attended each activity in the sample schools ranged

from 50 to 100 percent. Of the five sample schools, only three participated in all four of the basic project components. The 90 junior high school students were only able to visit the sponsoring firm. This was due, in part, to time constraints, to difficulties in coordinating school and law-firm schedules, and to the large number of participating students. As a result, students were divided into two groups for firm visits on separate days. The fifth school combined its orientation seminar with its firm visit.

Overall, sponsoring firms agreed that no one basic Mentor activity posed major implementation problems. However, all indicated that arranging activities was problematic. Trips to the courts, for example, were hard to arrange. This was due, in part, to the courts' calendars: cases were postponed; cases were settled. In addition, two firms noted that although case summaries were sent to Mentor teachers, students were not prepared for the courtroom visits. As a result, they could not appreciate fully what they were observing in the courtrooms.

Most teachers participated in or expected to participate in the elective or supplementary activities at the time of the interview.* Of the 17 teachers responding to the written survey on teacher background and Mentor activites, two-thirds indicated that they had participated in, or intended to participate in, the lawyers' visit to the classroom; approximately one-third had participated in, or intended to participate in, the legal writing and research elective; and one-third indicated that they had participated in, or intended to participate in, the visit of Family Court. Of the supple-

---

* Because teachers completed the questionnaires during the term, some had already participated in the activities while others were intending to take part in them at a later time.

mentary activities, nearly half of the teachers indicated that their school had participated in the mock-trial competitions, while only 18 percent had participated in the Model-City Council (an activity that has since been dropped from the program).

Evaluators interviewed 25 students about their participation in Mentor. They were overwhelmingly positive about Mentor activities. A large majority said that the visit to the sponsoring firm was the most interesting program component. These students were very enthusiastic about having met with attorneys. Most of these students had never met an attorney before and were quite impressed by the actual encounter. Meeting the legal support staff and seeing the legal research facilities also made a large impression. They also noted that these visits led to the realization of just how much time and work is required to prepare a case for trial. Generally, the students thought that the visits to the firms had given them a much better idea of what is involved in the practice of law.

Students also applauded the trips to the federal and state courts, but were divided as to which court system they preferred. About 12 percent of those interviewed did not find visiting a federal courtroom enjoyable. This was due to the nature of the case they observed; a difficult tax case, and as many students indicated, to the fact that they could not hear the proceedings from where they were sitting. The other students interviewed, however, were impressed with the attorneys' trial strategies, the role of the judge, and the proceedings' direct impact on the lives of the parties involved. Thus, these students were able to conclude from their observations that it makes a crucial difference in people's lives to have their day in court.

About one-half of the students interviewed enjoyed all of the basic activities and did not identify any Mentor activity as one they liked least. Twenty-eight percent did, however, cite Law Day, a culminating ceremony at Murry Bergtraum High School, as having fallen short of their expectations. One overall criticism of the program was that the various trips conflicted with other school activities including examinations.

CURRICULUM GUIDES

The use of the newly-developed two-volume curriculum manual was a major focus of the evaluation. Teachers completed a written survey describing their use of the manual in lesson planning, in topic selection, and in classroom and homework assignments. Teachers rated each of the four manual sections (Law as a Profession; Justice/Courts; Civil Law; and Criminal Law) using five criteria: 1) helpfulness in planning lessons; 2) providing information about the law; 3) fostering student interest; 4) providing student activities; and 5) suggesting resources. The teachers' mean ratings of the sections of the manual appear in Table 2. Teachers gave the highest overall rating to the civil law section of the manual. Evaluation findings indicate that the manual sections were least helpful in suggesting possible resources.

About one-half of the teachers (53 percent) used the manual in lesson planning and found some sections more useful than others. The section on the justice and civil and criminal court systems was used most frequently, while the "Law as a Profession" section was used by less than one-half (43 percent) of those surveyed. More than half of those surveyed (53 percent) used the sections on the court systems and criminal law. Few teachers used

Table 2

Teachers' Mean Ratings of Manual Topics

Manual rated for[a]:	Manual Section			
	Law as a Profession	Justice/ Courts	Civil Law	Criminal Law
Helpfulness in class preparation	2.9	3.1	3.4	2.8
Providing information on the law	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.2
Providing student activities	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.3
Fostering student interest	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.4
Suggesting possible resources	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.7

[a] Teachers rated each topic in the Mentor manual from "poor" (1) to "excellent" (4). Higher numbers indicate more positive ratings.

- Teachers gave the highest overall rating to the Civil Law section of the manual, and the lowest to Law as a Profession.
- Teachers generally saw the manual as most helpful in fostering student interest, and as least helpful in suggesting possible resources.

the manuals' activities and homework-assignment sections. The teachers mentioned several problems in using the guides: the need for more follow-up activities; more work-sheets; more resources, such as charts and graphs; the irrelevance of some topics, such as preparing for the state bar examination; the absence of materials in certain areas of criminal law, e.g., search and seizure; and in one instance, the difficulty of fitting the material into the school's existing social studies curriculum. Yet, despite their criticisms, teachers favored the continued availability of the manual.

Teachers particularly liked the section on civil law, and rated the manual from good to excellent in all areas except suggesting resources. Thirteen of the 14 teachers indicated that they would like the manual further subdivided into student workbooks and teacher guides. This subdivision would end teacher dependency on school copying facilities and would thus ensure that worksheets were readable. Teachers at only one high school thought the manual was too difficult for their students.

III. ATTITUDINAL FINDINGS

PROGRAM GOALS

Teachers and attorneys differed in their views of the goals of the Mentor program. Teachers, on the one hand, viewed the project's goals in broad general terms: they wanted students to see the law as ever-changing, reflecting society's values at any given point in time. Attorneys, on the other hand, viewed the project's goals as introducing students to the careers within the legal profession and providing positive role models. Descriptions of attorneys' goals at the New York Civil Liberties Union, however, were more in keeping with those of the teachers: to educate students as to their roles as citizens in a democracy. In addition, these attorneys wanted to increase students' awareness of the existing tension between the individual's rights and those of society as a whole.

All participating school-firm pairs believed overwhelmingly that the program's goals were achieved. A majority of teachers believed that the program increased student awareness of careers within the legal profession. Firm participants stated that students received a broad overview of the profession and its various components. Both teachers and attorneys were hopeful that student participants would now view the law as an ally, not an enemy.

Students viewed the program in much the same way. They were greatly impressed by the amount of work done in preparing a case for trial. They were also impressed by the legislative process involved in creating a new law and were surprised by the way the law evolves and changes.

They were shocked to discover the volume of cases that have to do with civil litigation; that law is more than just crime prevention. And, finally,

the terms "individual rights," "civil rights," and "constitutional protections" gained new meaning to the Mentor students interviewed.

ATTITUDINAL CHANGE

Seventy-two percent of the students interviewed said that Mentor had altered their attitudes toward the law. Some said Mentor increased their desire to become attorneys. Others said that the program helped them to realize the complexity of the legal system in the United States and that law really was more fair than they had initially believed. While most students were now more interested in the legal profession as a career option, a few students indicated that after having participated in Mentor they now believed that the law was too boring for them to consider it as a career choice. Interestingly, two out of the five students interviewed from the Manhattan school believed that they had become more law-abiding as a result of Mentor.

PARTICIPANT SUGGESTIONS

Scheduling difficulties continued to be a problem in Mentor. As in the pilot year, Mentor teachers had difficulty convincing other teachers that students excused for Mentor participation would have a worthwhile learning experience. These teachers suggested that stronger school support be elicited for Mentor as an out-of-school activity. Law firm participants requested more flexibility in scheduling in order to adjust to changes in the court calendar. This request is in juxtaposition to school regulations which necessitate long-range planning and fixed scheduling. As a resolution to this problem, both school and firm participants believe that Mentor should run throughout the school year. This would allow more flexibility in scheduling. Law firm participants also suggested that more school-firm

pairs plan joint field trips and that one attorney be charged with making all the court arrangements.

In Mentor 1983-84, problems arose concerning student preparation for and attendance at the courtroom visits. The three major problems in this area were identified as lack of student preparation by teachers; lack of teacher direction as to how firms could best use their resources to supplement existing school curriculum; and lack of attendance monitoring at Mentor activities. Both teachers and attorneys agree that firm members should visit the schools prior to the activities to assist in student preparation. More planning workshops were also suggested as a way to assist schools and firms in utilizing resources and augmenting the existing curriculum.

Firm attorneys made other suggestions. Many would like more workshops related to working with students. Some want more feedback from the students such as an end-of-program essay or letter. Others feel that there is too much emphasis on litigation and think that other areas of the profession should play a role in Mentor. Other suggestions included that participating students be less elite, more average, with curiosity, and a willingness to extend themselves. Overall, students, teachers, and attorneys involved with Mentor found it to be a valuable learning experience.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mentor was successful. Student participants said that their knowledge of and their attitude towards the law improved during the course of the program. Surprisingly, the greatest improvement in knowledge and attitude was among those students who did not fit the Mentor participant profile of the above-average student headed toward college. Teachers found the Mentor manual helpful and the training sessions worthwhile. The majority of the schools in the sample took part in most of the basic Mentor components, but participation in elective activities was somewhat limited because scheduling was a problem. Scheduling difficulties arose from the fact that schools need long-range planning. Fitting all the activities into a single term also proved problematic. Yet, Mentor 1983-84, expanded to 22 school firm pairs and nearly everyone involved with the program viewed it as a success.

Based on the findings of this evaluation, the following recommendations are made:

- Schools and law firms should be paired early enough to allow for more program preparation.
- A greater number of less academically-prepared students should be included in Mentor since this type of student showed the greatest positive change in attitude toward the legal system.
- The possibility of extending the program to a full year should be explored, perhaps by having a few pairs pilot such a program format.
- The feasibility of the elective activities should be reviewed in light of scheduling problems.
- Teacher-training workshops should include more exchanges among the teachers themselves.
- Training workshops for attorneys should be considered.
- Teachers' comments should be considered when revising the Mentor manual.

APPENDIX

Participating Schools in the 1983-84 MENTOR Program

SCHOOLS	LAW FIRMS
Murry Bertgraum High School for Business Careers 411 Pearl Street New York, NY 10038	Davis Polk & Wardwell 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza New York, NY 10005
William Cullen Bryant High School 48-10 31st Avenue Long Island City, NY 11103	Chadbourne Parke Whiteside & Wolff 30 Rockefeeler Plaza New York, NY 10112
Benjamin N. Cardozo High School 5700 223rd Street Bayside, NY 11364	Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom 919 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022
Curtis High School 105 Hamilton Avenue Staten Island, NY 10301	Mudge Rose Guthrie Alexander & Ferdon 180 Maiden Lane New York, NY 10038
Ditmas Junior High School 700 Cortelyou Road Brooklyn, NY 11218	Finley Kumble Wagner Heine Underberg Manley & Casey 425 Park Avenue New York, NY 10022
High School for the Humanities 351 West 18th Street New York, NY 10011	Debevoise & Plimpton 875 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022
John Jay High School 237 Seventh Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11215	Breed Abbott & Morgan 153 East 53rd Street New York, NY 10022
John F. Kennedy High School 99 Terrace View Avenue Bronx, NY 10463	Weil Gotshal & Manges 767 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10153
Herbert H. Lehman High School 3000 East Tremont Avenue Bronx, NY 10461	Rogers & Wells 200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10106
Francis Lewis High School 58-20 Utopia Parkway Flushing, NY 11365	Hughes Hubbard & Reed One Wall Street New York, NY 10005

SCHOOLS	LAW FIRMS
James Madison High School 3787 Bedford Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11229	Cadwalader Wickerman & Taft One Wall Street New York, NY 10005
August Martin High School 156-10 Baisley Boulevard Jamaica, NY 11434	Willkie Farr & Gallagher One Citicorp Center New York, NY 10022
Port Richmond High School Innis Street & St. Joseph Avenue Staten Island, NY 10302	Cahill Gordon & Reindel 80 Pine Street New York, NY 10005
Julia Richman High School 317 East 67th Street New York, NY 10021	New York Civil Liberties Union 84 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10011
	American Civil Liberties Union 132 West 43rd Street New York, NY 10036
Sheepshead Bay High School 3000 Avenue X Brooklyn, NY 11235	District Council 37 American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO 125 Barclay Street New York, NY 10007
South Shore High School 6565 Flatlands Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11236	White & Case 14 Wall Street New York, NY 10005
Adlai Stevenson High School 1980 Lafayette Avenue Bronx, NY 10473	J.C. Penney Company, Inc. 1301 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019
Philippa Schuyler Middle School for the Gifted and Talented 1300 Greene Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11237	Burns Summit Rovins & Feldesman 445 Park Avenue New York, NY 10022
Stuyvesant High School 345 East 15th Street New York, NY 10021	Cravath Swaine & Moore One Chase Manhattan Plaza New York, NY 10005
Samuel J. Tilden High School 5800 Tilden Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11203	New York City Law Department Office of the Corporation Counsel 100 Church Street New York, NY 10007

SCHOOLS	LAW FIRMS
Harry S. Truman High School 750 Baychester Avenue Bronx, NY 10475	Stroock & Stroock & Lavan Seven Hanover Square New York, NY 10004
Mark Twain Junior High School 2401 Neptune Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11224	Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy One Chase Manhattan Plaza New York, NY 10005